DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 187 JC 730 111

AUTHOR	Ross, Donald N.; Brown, Jennings G.
TITLE	Cost of Evaluating Faculty Performance at Antelope Valley Community College for the 1972-1973 School Year.
INSTITUTION	Antelope Valley Coll., Lancaster, Calif.
PUB DATE	3 May 73
NOTE	5p.; Paper presented at California Junior College Association Research Conference (Asilomar, California, May 2-4, 1973)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Costs; Evaluation Methods; *Expenditures; *Faculty Evaluation; Post Secondary Education; Tables (Data); Technical Reports; Unit Costs
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The costs incurred at Antelope Valley Community College (California) in evaluating the performance of college faculty members for the 1972-73 school year are summarized. Evaluation fell into two phases--implementation and operation. Implementation involved the issuance of written procedures, necessary forms, the purchase of equipment and supplies, and an initial series of meetings between the administrative staff and faculty. Cost summaries are divided into the two phases, showing two workload conditions. One assumes that manpower had to be paid as an extra charge to the district, and the other restricts manpower costs to new "in-hires" only. Persons evaluated totaled 105 and were divided into three groups--instructors, administration, and nonteaching certificated personnel. (KM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 076187

May 3, 1973

COST OF EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE AT ANTELOPE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR THE 1972-73 SCHOOL YEAR.

Prepared by Donald M. Ross, Trustee, and Jennings G. Brown, Dean of Instruction, Antelope Valley Community College, Lancaster, California.

Introduction. The purpose of this paper is to summarize the costs incurred at the Antelope Valley College in evaluating the performance of college faculty members for the 1972-73 school year as required by SB696 (1971) and AV college policy No. 4125. A brief discussion of costs, the faculty workforce, the evaluation method and pertinent background information is included.

The costs of evaluating faculty performance can vary widely between colleges because of (a) the evaluation method (b) faculty acceptance or rejection of the method (c) instructional workload (d) ratio of administrative staff to instructors, and similar factors. Antelope Valley College is one college where the instructional workload was light enough that the evaluation function could be absorbed as part of the normal workday responsibilities for instructors and Division Chairmen; but not so within the administrative staff where .4 professional person was added to the Office of the Dean of Instruction and temporary typists hired part-time as needed. In contrast, some colleges would probably have to pay overtime to instructors or even hire substitute teachers to relieve full-time instructors for evaluation.

Student Enrollment and Faculty. The pertinent statistics indicating the instructional workload, the size of the student body, the faculty and the administrative staff based on the 1972 fall semester are:

Student enrollment	4,068
Day - 2,329	
Evening - 1,739	
Total ADA (average daily attendance)	2,606
Full time regular[a] faculty	71
Full time contract[a] faculty	3
Part-time faculty	43
Average WSCH (weekly student contact hours), full-time faculty	490
Division Chairmen	9
Administrative Officers	6

[a]per SB696 definitions.

Relative to student enrollment and size of instructional staff, Antelope Valley College is representative of approximately one-fourth of the community colleges in California, the other three-fourths being larger.

Manhour Expenditures and Costs. Categorically, the evaluation effort at Antelope Valley College falls into two phases, e.g., the implementation phase and the operating phase. Implementation involved the issuance of written procedures, the necessary forms, purchase of equipment and supplies and an initial series of meetings between the administrative staff and faculty. The bulk of the implementation phase was accomplished during the summer, 1972. By the time

JC 730 111

the Fall semester started, the evaluation system was ready for involvement by faculty in what soon became routine for the two semesters of the 1972-73 school year.

Besides dividing the evaluation costs into an implementation phase and an operating phase, the cost summary presented in Table I shows two workload conditions. One condition (condition No. 1) assumes that the college work force was fully loaded at the time SB696 became a requirement and that the manpower expended in implementation and operation had to be paid as an extra charge to the district, as were all the supplies and equipment. The normal cost of manpower (no overtime) being paid by Antelope Valley College for the instructors and other personnel involved is assumed in Condition No. 1. The second condition (Condition No. 2) reports the actual direct costs to the college district in terms of manpower, supplies and equipment, with manpower costs restricted to new "in-hires" only; all supplies and equipment being treated as new additional costs chargeable to evaluation.

Table I summarizes the costs according to (a) implementation and (b) operation for Conditions No. 1 and No. 2.

Groupings of personnel evaluated in the Fall and Spring semesters are:

Fall 1972

Group I: 20 regular teaching faculty
18 non teaching assignments
22 part-time instructors

60 evaluations

Spring 1973

Group II: 15 regular teaching faculty
9 division chairmen
21 part-time faculty

45 evaluations

The costs of evaluating the performance of the 105 persons subsequent to the implement phase, giving recognition to Conditions No. 1 and No. 2 are:

	Condition No. 1	Condition No. 2
Fall semester	$12594	$ 5098
Spring semester	11392	5379
TOTAL	$23986	$10477
Cost per evaluee	$230	$100

The costs of implementation were $3111 and $829 for Conditions No. 1 and No. 2 respectively.

Policy and Procedure. Policy 4125 was adopted in June 1972 with inputs coming from all segments of the institution and the Board. The philosophy of the policy emphasized the purpose of evaluation is for the improvement of instruction (accountability).

Policy 4125 complies with SB696 and guidelines established by the Board of

Governors of California Community Colleges.

During the summer months of 1972, preparation of materials, forms, communication with faculty, establishment of calendar deadlines, decisions on whom to evaluate first, etc. took place. We were ready by September 1972.

Who is evaluated and how often:

1. Instructors
   a. part-time --every year
   b. full-time contract--every year
   c. full-time regular--every two years
2. administration - every year
3. nonteaching certificated personnel - every year
   a. counselors, librarians
   b. division chairmen
   c. coordinators, directors

Four groups of full-time certificated personnel were established; one group to be evaluated each semester of the two-year (four-semester) period. Contract instructors are included in the groups to be evaluated each Fall Semester. This means approximately 20 full-time certificated personnel are evaluated each semester. All instructors are evaluated each semester by students.

The part-time faculty (43) is evaluated once a year (both graded and nongraded classes): Fall Semester - 22 evaluated; Spring Semester - 21. Peer teams are not used in evaluation of part-time faculty which is done by Chairman, Dean of Extended Day or Dean of Instruction with input from students.

Approximately 27 nonteaching personnel are evaluated each year, including counselors, coordinators, administrators, directors, librarian, school nurse, business manager, and division chairmen.

The calendar schedule established for Group I evaluations (September 1972 - January 15, 1973) is listed below. Group I was comprised of 20 teaching personnel (full-time), 18 nonteaching positions and 22 part-time positions.

1. Preceding the first week of classes in September, total faculty meeting to review policy and evaluation procedure.
2. All course objectives available for students and on file.
3. Nomination of peer teams by evaluees.
4. Organizational meetings, peer team with evaluee to review objectives and methods.
5. Student evaluations (ninth week of the semester) to become available to peer team members (student evaluations each semester).
6. Classroom visitation by peer team members.
7. Peer team meeting together for writing of final evaluation report.
8. Final reports submitted to Dean of Instruction.
9. Peer team meets with evaluee and goes over final report and findings.
10. Peer team meets with Dean of Instruction and Superintendent-President and final report is made.

Reports are kept on file. A similar schedule and the same procedures apply to Group II personnel. A summary of evaluations for Groups I and II with recommendations by the Superintendent-President is submitted to the Board of Trustees in January and June, respectively.

Evaluated by whom:

A. Certificated Teaching Personnel

1. For instructional purposes
(on the basis of objectives, performance in class, effectiveness of instruction.)
   a. students evaluate
   b. peer team evaluates
   (three member team: one from outside division; one from division; and Dean of Instruction or Division Chairman)

2. Auxiliary duties
The effectiveness of the instructor in assigned responsibilities other than instruction (accountability) is coordinated by the Dean of Instruction. Evaluation done by individuals who are recipients of service or knowledgeable of the instructor's activities.

B. Certificated Nonteaching Personnel
Procedures similar to the process for teaching personnel but more personnel involved. This was to insure all segments who were recipients of the nonteaching personnel services would be involved in the process.

Effects of Evaluation Policy to Date.

1. The professional approach, attitude and cooperation of the faculty was excellent. Schedules have been met.
2. The general activity connected with evaluations campus-wide had staff members reviewing and revising objectives, course outlines to be more meaningful to themselves and above all to the students; even those staff members not being evaluated at the time.
3. Greater self-evaluation was taking place with regard to methods, techniques, etc.
4. Student evaluations seem to have great impact on instructors; seem to concern some instructors more so than peer team.
5. Peer teams in some instances went beyond anticipated effort in evaluating personnel. An average of two visits to classes of evaluee were made by each team member. Evaluation reports were well prepared and met policy requirements. Participation by team members attending schedule meetings was excellent.
6. The response of evaluees to final reports for the Fall Semester were very positive. Weaknesses, or areas needing attention for improvement, in many cases were recognized by evaluee.
7. After starting the process, all concerned became less apprehensive about the process.

Overall, faculty evaluation was implemented without noticeable difficulty and proceeded smoothly throughout the school year. The process broadened the viewpoint of the professional staff (administrators and faculty) and strengthened the rapport between faculty, administrative staff and the Board of Trustees. Hopefully, students received some direct benefit. This first year was consumed mostly by evaluation in contrast to a joint program of evaluation-development, although it is virtually impossible to participate in performance evaluation without experiencing some self-development. A better balance between evaluation and development is anticipated for the 1973-74 school year.

Table I - Costs of Faculty Performance Evaluation

Cost of Implementation	Condition No. 1	Condition No. 2
Manpower		
Administrative Staff	$1762 (144 hrs)	
Clerical	1049 (340 hrs)	$ 529 (195 hrs)
Equipment/Supplies	300	300
TOTAL	$3111	$ 829

Cost of Operation		
Fall Semester		
Manpower		
Administrative Staff	$6310 (585 hrs)	$3740 (352 hrs)
Instructors	5895 (601 hrs)	0
Clerical	1122 (433 hrs)	1091 (481 hrs)
Supplies	267	267
TOTAL	$12594	$5098
Spring Semester		
Manpower		
Administrative Staff	$5855 (545 hrs)	$3740 (352 hrs)
Instructors	3637 (373 hrs)	0
Clerical	1650 (580 hrs)	1389 (508 hrs)
Supplies	250	250
TOTAL	$11392	$5379

TOTAL COSTS		
Implementation	$3111	$ 829
Operation	$23986	$10477
Cost of operation per evaluee (105)	$230	$100

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 31 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION